

**Remarks**

Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 10-14, 18-20 and 23-25 are pending.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 14 and 20 have been amended to resolve the concerns noted by the Office in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action.

***Rejections Under Section 101***

Claim 25 has been amended to recite a computer readable medium and thereby more clearly recite statutory subject matter.

***Rejections Under Section 112***

Claims 11 and 12 have to been amended to correct the lack of antecedent basis noted by the Office in paragraph 6 of the Office Action.

***Rejections Based On Suzuki***

All pending claims stand rejected under Section 102 and 103 as being anticipated by Suzuki (5923013) (Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-14 and 18-20) or obvious over Suzuki in view of Shimuzu (6052202) (Claims 22-25).

Claims 1, 8, 10 and 14 each recite limitations related to processing images that occur more than once in a document according to different printing techniques, depending on which technique is indicated. For example, Claim 1 recites a means for:

(1) responding to the indicator indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form from the same video data by processing and printing the named sequence according to a first printing algorithm; and

(2) responding to the indicator indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm.

The Office asserts that Suzuki's JobSave field 54 and RipFileSave field 54 represent the same video data and new video data respectively, and that a form is processed as claimed at column 12, lines 10-27. This assertion is not correct.

The passage in Suzuki relied on by the Office teaches printing a previously saved print job. When the user specifies which saved print job is to be printed, the print programming routine checks to see whether or not the print job has already been rasterized/expanded (i.e., saved before RIP or save after RIP). If the print job was

saved before RIP (i.e., not expanded), then the file is rasterized/expanded before continuing the print routine. Suzuki, column 12, lines 10-27. The JobSave field 54 and RIPFileSave field 56 noted by the Office are simply the database fields used to designate what form to save the print job. JobSave field 54 is used to designate saving the print job before it is expanded, while RIPFileSave field is used to designate saving the print job after it is expanded. Suzuki, column 7, lines 13-17 and column 11, lines 10-17.

Suzuki says nothing about printing a "form" as recited in the claims. "Form" is specially defined in the Specification as an image that occurs more than once in a document. Specification, page 1, lines 17-20. There is nothing in Suzuki that even remotely suggests anything at all about printing images that occur more than once in a document. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain those passages in Suzuki that might somehow reasonably be deemed to suggest anything at all about printing a recurring image. Absent such a showing, the rejections should be withdrawn. The question of whether rasterizing saved print data (or not) in Suzuki constitutes the use of the "same" video data or "new" video data is irrelevant to the claimed invention. The claims are directed to printing each instance of a recurring image with the same video data or with new video data whether or not that data has been rasterized. Suzuki just isn't relevant to the claimed invention.

Specifically with regard to Claim 1, Suzuki does not teach a means for responding to an indicator indicating printing (1) each instance of a form, (2) from the same video data (3) according to a first printing algorithm, and (4) from new video data (5) according to a second printing algorithm.

Specifically with regard to Claim 10, Suzuki does not teach responding to a parameter being set to a first value indicating printing (1) each instance of a form (2) from the same video data (3) by converting the named sequence into video data and then using the video data to print each instance of the form, and responding to the parameter being set to a second value indicating printing each instance of the form (4) from new video data (5) by converting the named sequence into display list data and then (6) using the display list data to print each instance of the form.

Specifically with regard to Claim 14, Suzuki does not teach a means for generating a plurality of commands including a named sequence (1) describing a form and including at least one command (2) indicating permission is granted to convert the named sequence once into video data and to then print each instance of the form from the video data or (3) at least one command indicating new video data is to be generated to print each instance of the form.

The same analysis applies to Claims 22-25. Claims 22 recites a control unit configured to respond to PDL print commands that include a named sequence describing a form and an indicator by processing the named sequence according to one of three different printing algorithms depending on what the indicator indicates. Claim 25 recites printer firmware that includes programming for responding to PDL print commands that include a named sequence describing a form and an indicator by processing the named sequence according to one of three different printing algorithms depending on what the indicator indicates. Claim 23 recites programming configured to generate PDL print commands that include one of four different indicators. For all of the reasons noted above distinguishing Suzuki, the cited references do not teach or suggest the combinations recited in Claims 22-25.

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Steven R. Ormiston  
Reg. No. 35,974  
208.433.1991 x204